



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,778	02/27/2002	Melissa W. Dunn	MS# 300222.1 (MSFT 4969.1	1273
321	7590	02/06/2006	EXAMINER	
SENNIGER POWERS ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE 16TH FLOOR ST LOUIS, MO 63102			PATEL, CHIRAG R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/084,778	Applicant(s) DUNN, MELISSA W.	
	Examiner Chirag R. Patel	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 19, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. A discussion of the amended claims is provided below with respect to the prior art relied upon in the body of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of Ginter et al. - hereinafter Ginter - (US 2002/0112171) in view of Levergood et al. - hereinafter Levergood - (US 5,708,780).

As per claim 1, Ginter discloses the method of managing access by a client to user-specific information maintained in connection with a plurality of services, the method comprising:

maintaining a plurality of items of user-specific information; ([0017],[0043])

obtaining a plurality of client access requests directed to accessing the plurality of items of user-specific information maintained in the more than one of the plurality of services, said plurality of access requests being translated from a task request that requires the client to access the plurality of items of user-specific information in order to complete the task request; ([0060]) and

for each of the plurality of items of user-specific information required by the client to complete the task request: ([0627]; ROS 602 provided by the preferred embodiment extends conventional capabilities such as, for example, Access Control List (ACL) structures, to user and process defined events, including state transitions. ROS 602 may provide full control information over pre-defined and user-defined application events. These control mechanisms include "go/no-go" permissions, and also include optional event-specific executables that permit complete flexibility in the processing and/or controlling of events. This structure permits events to be individually controlled so that, for example, metering and budgeting may be provided using independent executables. For example, ROS 602 extends ACL structures to control arbitrary granularity of information. Traditional operating systems provide static "go-no go" control mechanisms at a file or resource level; ROS 602 extends the control concept in a general way from the largest to the smallest sub-element using a flexible control structure. ROS 602 can, for example, control the printing of a single paragraph out of a document file.)

determining if the client has consent to access the item of user-specific information required by the client to complete the task request; ([0216])

filling the client access request directed to the item if the client has consent to access the item of user-specific information ([0216])

Ginter fails to disclose obtaining consent from a party having authority to grant access , if the client lacks access. Levergood discloses selectively obtaining consent, from a party having authority to grant access to the client, for the client to access the item of user-specific information if the client lacks consent as a function of said determining; and (Col 6 lines 36-57) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to obtain consent from a party having authority to grant access, if the client lacks access in the disclosure of Ginter. The motivation for doing do would have been to obtain a valid SID. (Col 5 lines 42-65)

As per claim 2, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 1, and Ginter discloses initiating the task request requiring the client to access the plurality of items of user-specific information in order to complete the task request; (Col 5 lines 42-65)

and translating the task request into the plurality of client access requests to complete the task request. ([0216])

As per claim 3, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 2, and Ginter discloses wherein selectively obtaining consent for the client to access the item of user-specific information comprises:

identifying the task request, ([0935])

placing the identified task request in a task queue; and ([0935])

displaying a consent menu to the identified party with authority, said consent menu prompting the identified party to grant or deny consent for the client to access the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access. ([0197])

Ginter fails to disclose obtaining consent from a party having authority to grant access, if the client lacks access. Levergood discloses identifying a party having authority to grant access to the client, for the client to access the item of user-specific information if the client lacks consent as a function of said determining; and (Col 6 lines 36-57) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to obtaining consent from a party having authority to grant access , if the client lacks access in the disclosure of Ginter. The motivation would have been to obtain a valid SID. (Col 5 lines 42-65)

As per claim 4, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3 and Ginter discloses wherein the identified party with authority to grant consent is the user of the plurality of services offered by the web-services provider and wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the user. ([0197]).

As per claim 5, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3 and Ginter discloses wherein the identified party with authority to grant consent is an owner of the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access and

Art Unit: 2141

wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the owner. ([1078]).

As per claim 6, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method claim 5. Ginter discloses wherein the owner is the user of the plurality of services and wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the user. ([0197])

As per claim 7, Ginter / Levergood disclose discloses the method of claim 3 and Ginter discloses wherein the user of the plurality of services is a managed user and the identified party with authority to grant consent is a manager of the managed user and wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises displaying the consent menu to the manager of the managed user. ([1078])

As per claim 8, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3 and Ginter discloses wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party comprises:

displaying an indication of the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access; ([1961] – [1964])

displaying an identity of the client; and ([0218])

displaying an intended use of the client of the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access. ([1961] – [1964])

As per claim 9, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 8 and Ginter discloses wherein displaying a consent menu to the identified party further comprises displaying a method of access requested by the client to complete the initiated task request. ([0197],[2181])

As per claim 10, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 8 and Ginter discloses wherein displaying a consent menu to the identified party further comprises displaying an indication of a status of each of the plurality of client access requests translated from the task request. ([1806])

As per claim 11, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 8 and Ginter discloses wherein displaying a consent menu to the identified party further comprises displaying an indication of a status of each of the plurality of client access requests translated from the task request. ([0197])

As per claim 12, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3, and Ginter discloses identifying the plurality of client access requests to complete the task request, and identifying the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent to access. ([0196],[0197], [0216])

As per claim 13, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3, and Ginter discloses

providing a consent acceptance message being indicative of whether the identified party granted consent for the client to access the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent; and ([1346])

updating an access control list associated with the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent if the consent acceptance message indicates that the identified party granted consent, whereby upon updating said access control list, the client has consent to access the item of user-specific information ([0627])

As per claim 14, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 13 and Ginter discloses further comprising removing the identified task from the task queue if the consent acceptance message indicates that the identified party granted consent. ([0935],[1112])

As per claim 15, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method claim 13, and Ginter discloses the method of claim 13 further comprising transmitting a consent success message to the client, said consent success message being indicative of whether the identified party granted consent for the client to access the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent. ([1346])

As per claim 16, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 13, and Ginter discloses wherein updating the access control list further comprises setting a time limit in which the client has consent to access the item of user-specific information. ([1574])

As per claim 17, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3, and Ginter discloses wherein displaying the consent menu to the identified party displaying an invitation to allow the client enjoy a one-time only access to the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent. ([1153])

As per claim 18, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3, and Ginter discloses wherein selectively obtaining consent for the client to access the item of user-specific information farther comprises sending an alert message to the party with authority to grant consent, said alert message alerting the party with authority to grant consent that the client seeks access to the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent. ([1825])

As per claim 19, Ginter / Levergood disclose the method of claim 3, and Ginter discloses the method of claim 3 further comprising:

providing a consent acceptance message being indicative of whether the identified party granted consent for the client to access the item of user-specific information for which the client lacked consent; ([1346])

granting consent to allow the client to access the item of user-specific information if the consent acceptance message indicates that the indicated party granted consent.

([0627])

As per claim 20, Ginter discloses the method of claim 1, wherein one or more computer-readable media having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in claim 1. ([0016])

As per claims 21-48, please see the discussion above as they relate to the same rationale and subject matter as above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. These references are disclosed in the Notices of References cited page and teach methods for user-centric consent management system and method. A close review of these references is recommended.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R. Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairedirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).


SUPERVISOR EXAMINER